

NEUTRINO MASSES AND ANOMALOUS INTERACTIONS

ERNEST MA

*Department of Physics, University of California
Riverside, CA 92521, USA*

The interplay between neutrino masses and the interactions of neutrinos with matter is discussed with an eye to extending the latter to include possible new interactions. This conjecture may resolve the conundrum posed by the present experimental data on neutrino oscillations which suggest the existence of four neutrinos, whereas Z decay and Big Bang Nucleosynthesis allow only three. The case of a possible sterile neutrino is also briefly discussed.

1 Neutrino Masses

In the minimal standard model, under the gauge group $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$, the quarks and leptons transform as:

$$\begin{bmatrix} u \\ d \end{bmatrix}_L \sim (3, 2, 1/6), \quad u_R \sim (3, 1, 2/3), \quad d_R \sim (3, 1, -1/3); \quad (1)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \nu \\ l \end{bmatrix}_L \sim (1, 2, -1/2), \quad l_R \sim (1, 1, -1). \quad (2)$$

There is also the Higgs scalar doublet $(\phi^+, \phi^0) \sim (1, 2, 1/2)$ whose nonzero vacuum expectation value $\langle \phi^0 \rangle = v$ breaks $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ to $U(1)_Q$. Note that the existence of the term

$$\overline{(\nu, l)}_L l_R \begin{bmatrix} \phi^+ \\ \phi^0 \end{bmatrix} \implies m_l \neq 0. \quad (3)$$

However, the absence of ν_R implies that $m_\nu = 0$.

The canonical way of obtaining small neutrino masses is via the seesaw mechanism¹. This assumes the existence of one $\nu_R \sim (1, 1, 0)$ for each ν_L , so that we have the terms

$$\frac{m_D}{v} \overline{(\nu, l)}_L \nu_R \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\phi}^0 \\ -\phi^- \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{2} M \nu_R \nu_R. \quad (4)$$

Thus the 2×2 neutrino mass matrix linking $\bar{\nu}_L$ to ν_R is given by

$$\mathcal{M} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & m_D \\ m_D & M \end{bmatrix} \implies m_\nu = \frac{m_D^2}{M}. \quad (5)$$

Here, $\nu_L - \nu_R^c$ mixing is m_D/M and M is the scale of new physics. In this minimal scenario, new physics enters only through M , hence there is no other observable effect except for a nonzero m_ν . Actually, m_D/M is in principle observable but it is in practice far too small.

2 Neutrino Oscillations

It is well-known that neutrinos may oscillate into one another if their mass eigenstates do not coincide with their interaction eigenstates. Let

$$\nu_e = \nu_1 \cos \theta + \nu_2 \sin \theta, \quad (6)$$

$$\nu_\mu = -\nu_1 \sin \theta + \nu_2 \cos \theta, \quad (7)$$

where $m_{\nu_1} \neq m_{\nu_2}$, then if ν_e is created at $t = 0$, $\vec{x} = 0$; at a later t and $\vec{x}$ away, ν_e becomes

$$e^{-i(E_1 t - \vec{p} \cdot \vec{x})} \nu_1 \cos \theta + e^{-i(E_2 t - \vec{p} \cdot \vec{x})} \nu_2 \sin \theta. \quad (8)$$

The probability that this state would be measured as ν_e (by producing e) is

$$|\cos^2 \theta + e^{-i(E_2 - E_1)t} \sin^2 \theta|^2 = 1 - \frac{1}{2} \sin^2 2\theta [1 - \cos(E_2 - E_1)t], \quad (9)$$

where $E_{1,2} \simeq p(1 + m_{1,2}^2/2p^2)$. Now

$$(E_2 - E_1)t \simeq \frac{(m_2^2 - m_1^2)t}{2p} \simeq \frac{(\Delta m^2)L}{2E}, \quad (10)$$

hence the probability that ν_e remains ν_e is given by

$$P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_e) = 1 - \frac{1}{2} \sin^2 2\theta \left[1 - \cos \frac{(\Delta m^2)L}{2E} \right]. \quad (11)$$

Note that the sign of Δm^2 does not matter in this case.

In traversing matter, neutrinos interact with the electrons and nuclei of the intervening material and their forward coherent scattering induces an effective mass analogous to the occurrence of an index of refraction for light, and may result in the resonance conversion of one flavor to another, *i.e.* the famous MSW effect². There are two kinds of known interactions: (A) the exchange of a charged W boson between ν_e and e , and (B) the exchange of a neutral Z boson between ν_e or ν_μ with electrons and quarks. The latter is identical for all neutrino flavors. The evolution equation for neutrino oscillations in matter is then given by

$$-i \frac{d}{dt} |\nu\rangle_{e,\mu} = \left(p + \frac{\mathcal{M}^2}{2p} \right) |\nu\rangle_{e,\mu}, \quad (12)$$

where

$$\mathcal{M}^2 = \mathcal{U} \begin{bmatrix} m_1^2 & 0 \\ 0 & m_2^2 \end{bmatrix} \mathcal{U}^\dagger + \begin{bmatrix} A+B & 0 \\ 0 & B \end{bmatrix}. \quad (13)$$

In the above, the charged-current interaction A applies only to ν_e and is given by

$$A = \pm 2\sqrt{2}G_F N_e p \begin{cases} + \text{ for } \nu \\ - \text{ for } \bar{\nu} \end{cases}, \quad (14)$$

where N_e is the number density of electrons in matter. For

$$\mathcal{U} = \begin{pmatrix} c & s \\ -s & c \end{pmatrix}, \quad (15)$$

we get

$$\mathcal{M}^2 = \begin{bmatrix} c^2 m_1^2 + s^2 m_2^2 + A + B & sc(m_2^2 - m_1^2) \\ sc(m_2^2 - m_1^2) & s^2 m_1^2 + c^2 m_2^2 + B \end{bmatrix}. \quad (16)$$

A resonance occurs when $\mathcal{M}_{11}^2 = \mathcal{M}_{22}^2$, namely

$$(m_2^2 - m_1^2) \cos 2\theta - A = 0. \quad (17)$$

Since $A > 0$ for ν_e coming from the sun, $m_2 > m_1$ is required for the MSW effect.

3 Three Neutrinos versus Four Neutrinos

Present experimental evidence for neutrino oscillations³ includes the solar ν_e deficit which requires Δm^2 of around 10^{-5} eV² for the MSW explanation or 10^{-10} eV² for the vacuum-oscillation solution, the atmospheric neutrino deficit in the ratio $\nu_\mu + \bar{\nu}_\mu / \nu_e + \bar{\nu}_e$ which implies a Δm^2 of around 10^{-2} eV², and the LSND experiment which indicates a Δm^2 of around 1 eV². Three different Δm^2 necessitate four neutrinos, but the invisible width of the Z boson as well as Big Bang Nucleosynthesis allow only three. If all of the above-mentioned experiments are interpreted correctly as due to neutrino oscillations, we are faced with a theoretical challenge in trying to understand how three can equal four.

One possibility is that there is a light singlet neutrino in addition to the three known doublet neutrinos ν_e , ν_μ , and ν_τ . If so, why is this singlet light and how does it mix with the other three neutrinos? Both questions can be answered in a model⁴ based on E_6 inspired by superstring theory. In the fundamental **27** representation of E_6 , outside the 15 fields belonging to the minimal standard model, there are 2 neutral singlets. One (N) is identifiable

with the right-handed neutrino because it is a member of the **16** representation of $SO(10)$; the other (S) is a singlet also under $SO(10)$. In the reduction of E_6 to $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$, an extra $U(1)$ gauge factor may survive down to the TeV energy scale. It could be chosen such that N is trivial under it, but S is not. This means that N is allowed to have a large Majorana mass so that the usual seesaw mechanism works for the three doublet neutrinos. At the same time, S is protected from having a mass by the extra $U(1)$ gauge symmetry, which I call $U(1)_N$. However, it does acquire a small mass from an analog of the usual seesaw mechanism because it can couple to doublet neutral fermions which are present in the **27** of E_6 outside the **16** of $SO(10)$. Furthermore, the mixing of S with the doublet neutrinos is also possible through these extra doublet neutral fermions. For details, see Ref. [4].

4 Three Neutrinos and One Anomalous Interaction

If one insists on keeping only the usual three neutrinos and yet try to accommodate all present data, how far can one go? It has been pointed out by many authors⁵ that both solar and LSND data can be explained, as well as most of the atmospheric data except for the zenith-angle dependence. It is thus worthwhile to consider the following scenario⁶ whereby a possible anomalously large ν_τ -quark interaction may mimic the observed zenith-angle dependence of the atmospheric data. Consider first the following approximate mass eigenstates:

$$\nu_1 \sim \nu_e \quad \text{with } m_1 \sim 0, \quad (18)$$

$$\nu_2 \sim c_0 \nu_\mu + s_0 \nu_\tau \quad \text{with } m_2 \sim 10^{-2} \text{ eV}, \quad (19)$$

$$\nu_3 \sim -s_0 \nu_\mu + c_0 \nu_\tau \quad \text{with } m_3 \sim 0.5 \text{ eV}, \quad (20)$$

where $c_0 \equiv \cos \theta_0$, $s_0 \equiv \sin \theta_0$, and θ_0 is not small. Allow ν_1 to mix with ν_3 with a small angle θ' and the new ν_1 to mix with ν_2 with a small angle θ , then the LSND data can be explained with $\Delta m^2 \sim 0.25 \text{ eV}^2$ and $2s_0 s' c' \sim 0.19$ and the solar data can be understood as follows.

Consider the basis ν_e and $\nu_\alpha \equiv c_0 \nu_\mu + s_0 \nu_\tau$. Then the analog of Eq. (12) holds with Eq. (13) replaced by

$$\mathcal{M}^2 = \mathcal{U} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & m_2^2 \end{bmatrix} \mathcal{U}^\dagger + \begin{bmatrix} A+B & 0 \\ 0 & B+C \end{bmatrix}, \quad (21)$$

where C comes from the anomalous ν_τ -quark interactions in the sun. The resonance condition is now

$$m_2^2 \cos 2\theta - A + C = 0, \quad (22)$$

where⁷

$$A - C = 2\sqrt{2}G_F(N_e - s_0^2\epsilon'_q N_q)p. \quad (23)$$

In order to have a large ϵ'_q and yet satisfy the resonance condition for solar-neutrino flavor conversion, m_2 should be larger than its canonical value of 2.5×10^{-3} eV, and ϵ'_q should be negative. [If ϵ'_q comes from R -parity violating squark exchange, then it must be positive, in which case an inverted mass hierarchy, *i.e.* $m_2 < m_1$ would be needed. If it comes from vector exchange, it may be of either sign.] Assuming as a crude approximation that $N_q \simeq 4N_e$ in the sun, the usual MSW solution with $\Delta m^2 = 6 \times 10^{-6}$ eV² is reproduced here with

$$s_0^2\epsilon'_q \simeq -3.92 = -4.17(m_2^2/10^{-4}\text{eV}^2) + 0.25. \quad (24)$$

The seemingly arbitrary choice of $\Delta m_{21}^2 \sim 10^{-4}$ eV² is now seen as a reasonable value so that ϵ'_q can be large enough to be relevant for the following discussion on the atmospheric neutrino data.

Atmospheric neutrino oscillations occur between ν_μ and ν_τ in this model with $\Delta m_{32}^2 \sim 0.25$ eV², the same as for the LSND data, but now it is large relative to the E/L ratio of the experiment, hence the cosine factor of Eq. (11) washes out and

$$P_0(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\mu) = 1 - \frac{1}{2} \sin^2 2\theta_0 \simeq 0.66 \quad \text{for } s_0 \simeq 0.47. \quad (25)$$

In the standard model, this would hold for all zenith angles. Hence it cannot explain the present experimental evidence that the depletion is more severe for neutrinos coming upward to the detector through the earth than for neutrinos coming downward through only the atmosphere. This zenith-angle dependence appears also mostly in the multi-GeV data and not in the sub-GeV data. It is this trend which determines Δm^2 to be around 10^{-2} eV² in this case. As shown below, the hypothesis that ν_τ has anomalously large interactions with quarks will mimic this zenith-angle dependence even though Δm^2 is chosen to be much larger, *i.e.* 0.25 eV².

Consider the basis ν_μ and ν_τ . Then the analog of Eq. (12) holds with Eq. (13) replaced by

$$\mathcal{M}^2 = \mathcal{U}_0 \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & m_3^2 \end{bmatrix} \mathcal{U}_0^\dagger + \begin{bmatrix} B & 0 \\ 0 & B + C \end{bmatrix}. \quad (26)$$

The resonance condition is then

$$m_3^2 \cos 2\theta_0 + C = 0, \quad (27)$$

where N_q in C now refers to the quark number density inside the earth and the factor s_0^2 in Eq. (23) is not there. If C is large enough, the probability P_0 would not be the same as the one in matter. Using the estimate $N_q \sim 9 \times 10^{30} \text{ m}^{-3}$ and defining

$$X \equiv \epsilon'_q E_\nu / (10 \text{ GeV}), \quad (28)$$

the effective mixing angles in matter are given by

$$\tan 2\theta_m^E = \frac{\sin 2\theta_0}{\cos 2\theta_0 + 0.091X} \quad \text{for } \nu, \quad (29)$$

$$\tan 2\bar{\theta}_m^E = \frac{\sin 2\theta_0}{\cos 2\theta_0 - 0.091X} \quad \text{for } \bar{\nu}. \quad (30)$$

For sub-GeV neutrinos, X is small so matter effects are not very important. For multi-GeV neutrinos, X may be large enough to satisfy the resonance condition of Eq. (27). Assuming adiabaticity, the neutrino and antineutrino survival probabilities are given by

$$P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\mu) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \cos 2\theta_0 \cos 2\theta_m^E), \quad (31)$$

$$\bar{P}(\bar{\nu}_\mu \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_\mu) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \cos 2\theta_0 \cos 2\bar{\theta}_m^E). \quad (32)$$

Since $\sigma_\nu \simeq 3\sigma_{\bar{\nu}}$, the observed ratio of $\nu + \bar{\nu}$ events is then

$$P_m \simeq \frac{3rP + \bar{P}}{3r + 1}, \quad (33)$$

where r is the ratio of the ν_μ to $\bar{\nu}_\mu$ flux in the upper atmosphere. The atmospheric data are then interpreted as follows. For neutrinos coming down through only the atmosphere, $P_0 = 0.66$ applies. For neutrinos coming up through the earth, $P_m \simeq P_0 \simeq 0.66$ as well for the sub-GeV data. However, for the multi-GeV data, if $X = -15$, then $P = 0.31$ and $\bar{P} = 0.76$, hence P_m is lowered to 0.39 if $r = 1.5$ or 0.42 if $r = 1.0$. The apparent zenith-angle dependence of the data may be explained.

5 Conclusion and Outlook

If all present experimental indications of neutrino oscillations turn out to be correct, then either there is at least one sterile neutrino beyond the usual ν_e , ν_μ , and ν_τ , or there is an anomalously large ν_τ -quark interaction. The latter can be tested at the forthcoming Sudbury Neutrino Observatory (SNO) which has the capability of neutral-current detection. The predicted Δm^2 of 0.25

eV^2 in ν_μ to ν_e and ν_τ oscillations will also be tested at the long-baseline neutrino experiments such as Fermilab to Soudan 2 (MINOS), KEK to Super-Kamiokande (K2K), and CERN to Gran Sasso.

More immediately, the new data from Super-Kamiokande, Soudan 2, and MACRO on $\nu_\mu + \bar{\nu}_\mu$ events through the earth should be analyzed for such an effect. For a zenith angle near zero, the $\Delta m^2 \sim 10^{-2} \text{ eV}^2$ oscillation scenario should have $R \sim 1$, whereas the $\Delta m^2 \sim 0.25 \text{ eV}^2$ oscillation scenario (with anomalous interaction) would have $R = P_0 \sim 0.66$. Furthermore, if ν and $\bar{\nu}$ can be distinguished (as proposed in the HANUL experiment), then to the extent that CP is conserved, matter effects can be isolated.

Acknowledgments

I thank Gustavo Branco and all the other organizers of this stimulating School and Workshop for their hospitality. This work was supported in part by the U. S. Department of Energy under Grant No. DE-FG03-94ER40837.

References

1. M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond, and R. Slansky, in *Supergravity, Proc. of the Workshop*, Stony Brook, New York, 1979, eds. P. Van Nieuwenhuizen and D. Z. Freedman (North-Holland, 1979), p. 315; T. Yanagida, in *Proc. of the Workshop on the Unified Theory and the Baryon Number in the Universe*, Tsukuba, Japan, 1979, eds. O. Sawada and A. Sugamoto (KEK Report No. 79-18, Tsukuba, Japan, 1979).
2. L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Rev. **D17**, 2369 (1978); **20**, 2634 (1979); S. P. Mikheyev and A. Yu. Smirnov, Yad. Fiz. **42**, 1441 (1985) [Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **42**, 913 (1985)]; Nuovo Cim. **C9**, 17 (1986).
3. For an updated review, see A. Yu. Smirnov in these Proceedings.
4. E. Ma, Phys. Lett. **B380**, 286 (1996).
5. C. Y. Cardall and G. M. Fuller, Phys. Rev. **D53**, 4421 (1996). See also the earlier work of S. M. Bilenky, A. Bottino, C. Giunti, and C. W. Kim, Phys. Lett. **B356**, 273 (1995); K. S. Babu, J. C. Pati, and F. Wilczek, *ibid.*, **B359**, 351 (1995); G. L. Fogli, E. Lisi, and G. Scioscia, Phys. Rev. **D52**, 5334 (1995).
6. E. Ma and P. Roy, UCRHEP-T186 (September, 1997).
7. M. M. Guzzo, A. Masiero, and S. T. Petcov, Phys. Lett. **B260**, 154 (1991); E. Roulet, Phys. Rev. **D44**, R935 (1991); V. Barger, R. J. N. Phillips, and K. Whisnant, Phys. Rev. **D44**, 1629 (1991); P. I. Krastev and J. N. Bahcall, hep-ph/9703267.